Published in final edited form as:

J Nutr Educ Behav. 2019 March ; 51(3): 277–286. doi:10.1016/j.jneb.2018.07.003.

Using Theory to Evaluate the Implementation and Integration of an Expanded School Breakfast Program in Rural Midwestern High Schools

Valarie K. Frigge, MPH, RD,
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities

Marilyn S. Nanney, PhD, MPH, RD,
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities

Lisa Harnack, DrPH, MPH, RD,
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities

Margaret Haggemiller, Med, and
University of Minnesota - Duluth

Rebekah Pratt, PhD
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities

Abstract

Objective: Utilizing the Normalization Process Theory (NPT) to evaluate the implementation and integration of the expanded School Breakfast Program (SBP).

Design: Interviews were conducted during the 2014–2015 school year. Normalization Process Theory (NPT) guided the interview questions.

Setting: Rural high schools in Minnesota.

Participants: Interviews were conducted with twelve food service directors (N=12) and eleven principals (N=11) from the Project breakFAST intervention. Four of the schools were in their first year, while eight of the twelve schools were in their second year of providing the expanded SBP program to their students.

Phenomenon of Interest: NPT was used to evaluate the implementation and integration of the expanded SBP into rural Midwestern high schools.

Analysis: Three members of the research team used the NVivo 10 software to code and analyze the interviews. Emerged themes were reported.

Results: Modifying the SBP aligned with values of the study participants (coherence). Support was obtained from staff, students and community members (cognitive participation). Operational

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

work occurred in each of the schools to establish and integrate the modified SBP (coll action). The SBP expansion was assessed through student participation rates (ref monitoring).

Conclusions and Implications: NPT can be used to evaluate the implementation, embedding and integration of a modified SBP into a school program. This evaluation can support other schools in modifying and embedding their SBPs into their school environment.

INTRODUCTION

Elementary and middle schools are experimenting with expanding and enhancing their School Breakfast Program (SBP) to increase participation and entice students to eat breakfast^{1, 2}. Schools have traditionally offered students breakfast in the cafeteria before school starts, but now some SBPs are expanding to fit student needs. Some schools are adding a convenient Grab and Go breakfast cart outside of the cafeteria and/or are offering second chance breakfast after the first few periods of the school day as well as adding other modifications to make the breakfast program easier to access. Research suggests these program modifications are helpful in achieving increased participation objectives in schools^{1,2,3,4} but less is known about the process of successfully integrating these modifications into the high school environment.

Project breakFAST (Fueling Academics and Strengthening Teens) was created to expand the SBP, counteract barriers to students eating breakfast at school and increase program participation⁵. Project breakFAST targeted rural high schools in Minnesota. This is an important population to engage because of the difference between the rates of student participation in rural, urban and suburban areas⁶. More students in the city participate in the SBP than rural areas and more students in the South participate in the SBP compared to students in the Midwest or Northeastern parts of the United States⁷. Research is lacking in expanding and sustaining the SBP in rural high schools specifically.

According to the US Department of Agriculture's (USDA) School Nutrition Dietary Assessment Study - IV, only 28 percent of all students participated in the SBP in the 2009–2010 school year⁸. According to Food Research and Action Center (FRAC), 85 percent of the students who participated in the SBP in 2013 received a free or reduced-priced breakfast⁴. This population can benefit from expanding the SBP and increasing participation. According to the Economic Research Service of the USDA, food insecurity is more prevalent in rural areas compared to suburban areas in the United States⁹. Rural families are more likely to receive needs-based social support than urban families and encouraging children to participate in school nutrition programs may help increase household food security¹⁰. Expanding the SBP may also benefit students in rural areas who may have long commutes and bus rides, which can be a barrier in making it to school in time to eat breakfast before class starts⁷. Rural schools may benefit from an intervention such as Project breakFAST because of the support provided to the schools in the intervention. A study conducted in rural elementary schools in Colorado found that schools had weakly worded local wellness policies and low implementation of evidenced- based nutrition practices which may be attributed to lack of administration, financial and technical support¹¹.

Prior research with SBP interventions has assisted in understanding general staff roles in the SBP expansion. High school administration and staff are pertinent in creating change to any school nutrition initiative^{2,12,13,14}. Principal support is crucial in changing school nutrition environment and policy as well as motivating and communicating changes to staff^{2,13,14}. Food service and other school staff are important to include in program planning and implementation and may emerge as champions in creating a successful SBP expansion^{2,12,14}. Food service directors are significant in leading nutrition program changes as well as expanding the program into other schools³. Although there is evidence of the impact school personnel can have on expanding the SBP, there is little research on the SBP implementation processes, or information on student involvement in expanding the SBP^{1, 2,12,13,14}. One study, found the benefit of actively involving students by working with them to change and market the SBP¹⁵. Our study will expand on this concept and discuss changing students' perceptions and attitudes about the SBP.

The following study was conducted to expand on previous research of implementing an expanded SBP and to understand how the SBP can become normalized in the school environment. To do this we drew on Normalization Process Theory (NPT) as an approach to help understand how the SBP expansion was implemented, integrated and sustained in high schools in rural Minnesota¹⁶. NPT is an implementation science framework focused on researching the processes by which interventions become successfully implemented.¹⁶ By understanding these processes, NPT can facilitate the sharing of research findings in ways that can be adopted by others into further research or practice. The NPT's four constructs coherence, cognitive participation, collective action and reflexive monitoring can be used to further our understanding of the planning and implementation of the expanded SBP. The researchers wanted to understand how the study participants, the food service directors and principals at each of the schools, made sense of the expanded school breakfast program (coherence), the relational work that occurred to change the program (cognitive participation), the operational work that was implemented to change and integrate the SBP (collective action) and the continued appraisal of the expanded SBP to ensure it maintained program objectives and was embedded into the school environment (reflexive monitoring)¹⁶. While there is a growing body of literature on aspects of interventions, such as key roles, NPT builds on this by allowing consideration of the many aspects of how modifications may become normalized into the usual school day.

The aim of this study was to utilize NPT to evaluate the implementation and integration of the SBP expansion in rural high schools from administration and food service directors' perspectives in Minnesota. This research will inform other interested schools in implementing best practices in expanding their SBP.

METHODS

Semi-structured interviews were conducted in school years 2014 – 2015, with principals and food service directors who participated in the Project breakFAST study. The purpose of the interviews was to understand the perceptions of the principals and food service directors in how the SBP expansion was implemented and maintained at each of the participating high

schools. The University's Institutional Review Board approved this study and each school principal and food service director involved consented to participate.

To assist in understanding how the SBP expansion was implemented and maintenance in the high schools participating in Project breakFAST, NPT was selected by the research team to understand and organize the implementation methods of the intervention. Historically, NPT was created to understand the individual and collective organization of implementing, embedding and integrating a new practice primarily into the healthcare setting, but has now evolved to be applied to other social settings.¹⁶ NPT can be utilized to assist with the normalization of a practice into a similar setting.¹⁶ The researchers hope other schools benefit from the individual and organizational methods reviewed in the study to assist with growing their own SBPs.

Participants

Twelve rural high schools in Minnesota participated in the Project breakFAST study. Four of the schools were in their first year, while eight of the twelve schools were in their second year of providing the expanded SBP program to their students. Enrollment at each of the participating high schools ranged between 302 and 1,887 students. Students of non-white ethnicity in each of the schools ranged from 3 percent to 33 percent. Students who received free or reduced-priced lunch ranged from 20 percent to 58 percent in participating high schools. Interviews were conducted with 11 principals and 12 food service directors. One principal could not be reached for an interview because he had retired before the interviews were scheduled.

Instrument

A set of semi-structured interview questions were developed by the research team and were created to understand the implementation and integration of the SBP expansion that occurred at each of the participating high schools. The questions developed were informed by NPT, through reviewing the core constructs and ensuring that the interview questions explored these different aspects of intervention implementation. This ensured a systematic review of the important common features of successful intervention implementation as identified by NPT.¹⁶ The researchers reviewed and created questions that fit into the NPT's core constructs: coherence, cognitive participation, collective action and reflexive monitoring. See table 1 for the questions by construct.

Procedure

The participating principals and food service directors were contacted separately to set up a time to talk to one of two members of the research team who were responsible for carrying out these interviews. At the time of the appointment, one member of the research team called the study participant over the phone. Verbal consent was given by each of the study participants before the interview was conducted. All of the interviews were conducted over the phone and digitally recorded. The average length of time of the interviews was 38 minutes.

Data Analysis

The interviews were transcribed and uploaded into the NVivo 10 software. After members of the research team reviewed the responses from all of the interviews, NVivo 10 was used to organize all of the data from the interview responses into common themes reported throughout the interviews. Two members of the research team coded all of the interviews separately. The coders had also conducted half the interviews each. They met with a qualitative researcher during coding to discuss common themes and organization of the data. During these discussions areas of agreement or divergence between coders was discussed, and a common codebook was developed and applied iteratively. The process of social constructivist grounded theory, which allows themes to grow from the data also reviewing key theories and literature alongside that process^{17, 18} guided the thematic analysis. The initial analysis and codebook were developed inductively, and was driven by the data. The inductive themes were further reviewed in relation to the NPT constructs, drawing on a deductive approach, where the codebook was reviewed for areas of agreement or contrast within the conceptual areas.

RESULTS

The themes that emerged from the analysis are described in relation to the constructs of the NPT. Table 2 provides a summary and additional illustrative quotes.

Coherence: Initiating the SBP Expansion

The majority of principals and food service directors supported the idea of changing their SBP by understanding the benefits of changing and defining the SBP expansion. The food service directors and principals interviewed described how they were approached with the idea, factors that motivated them to participate, as well as making sense of and understanding how to expand their SBP. Many principals and food service directors found importance in changing the SBP that aligned well with their organizational and individual values. The individual and shared values as well as the perceived benefits of expanding the SBP conveyed the internalization and communal specification components of the coherence construct. Most principals hoped students would benefit academically, physically and mentally by creating an environment where students participated in the SBP daily.

Many principals and food service directors were both motivated the SBP to provide a way to reach students that did not have regular access to meals at home. Most food service directors saw the opportunity to participate in Project breakFAST to try to maintain SBP participation rates from elementary school through high school in turn, increasing revenue as well as creating a more positive image of the meal program.

“But participation, number one, giving students that ability to have breakfast. To help them academically was another one, and then ultimately to help the food service department at (our school) doesn’t have a very large fund balance and if we could increase participation at breakfast, hopefully it would also increase revenue for the department in a very positive way.”-(Food Service Director)

Food service directors, principals, students, and other staff had to define and develop the expanded SBP for their setting. Study participants described creating planning committees called School Breakfast Expansion Teams (SBET) to set goals, organize the logistics of the expanded SBP, along with communicating the changes to other staff, students and parents. All study participants in Project breakFAST chose to expand their SBP by offering a second chance breakfast on Grab and Go carts to students.

Principals and/or food service directors at a few schools reported they were challenged with obtaining coherence between administration, foodservice directors and other staff and faculty.

Question: “What would you say was the biggest challenge or barrier in modifying the school breakfast program? “

Answer: “It was the policies, no support really. “(Food Service Director)

Some principles/food service directors overcame this barrier by educating staff and faculty on the importance of the expanded SBP, by choosing another point person to lead the SBP expansion project, or by solving barriers together with staff. One food service director could not get administration onboard with the changes and could not overcome school policies to implement the Grab and Go breakfast cart in the hallways of the school. Because the food service director could not overcome this barrier, she reported she gave up trying to expand their SBP.

Cognitive Participation: Communicating changes and involving key staff and students in the SBP expansion

Communication regarding changes was described as important to enroll, initiate and activate the participation of key stakeholders as well as legitimize the process of the SBP expansion for all involved members. Most food service directors and principals described getting staff on board by sharing their vision for the program, discussing the changes and objectives of the SBP and asking for their input early in the planning process.

Many principals and food service directors described the importance of educating partents and The community about the values of the expanded SBP. Some repoted that their school created awareness around the SBP expansion through activities such as education talks on the local radio station and sharing student dats regarding the lack of SBP participation with local newspapers. Newsletters, parent nights and open houses were reported as ways that parents were informed about SBP expansion.

Engaging the students in the intervention was described as a key facilitator in ensuring the students should be involved with the program. Most principals and food service directors indicated that involving and focusing on the students in the SBP expansion helped to change student perceptions and acceptance of the program. Involving students on SBETs empowered them to lead in defining and creating a SBP that worked for and interested them and their peers. Many principals and food service directors indicated that students led marketing campaigns provided feedback to food service as well as took leadership roles in presentations to faculty members, peers, school board members, maintenance staff and

community members. Involving the students in the SBP expansion empowered them to drive program changes forward. It placed accountability and responsibility on the students to develop a SBP that met their individual and collective needs along with increasing participation in the program, which reinforced the coherence of continually defining a program that serves students' needs.

“Best practices, again, listen, feedback, communication from the students is essential for the success because unless you're providing them with the variety of the foods that they will actually ingest, it won't serve a purpose. “ - (Food Service Director)

Collective Action: Implementing the SBP expansion

Most food service directors and principals were leaders in the contextual the expanded SBP in the schools. All of the food service directors and a few principals worked with multiple people in and outside of the school, to create plans, design the layout of the cart, as well as purchase and set up equipment for their Grab and Go breakfast carts.

The majority of food service directors played a key role in obtaining participation from the food service staff. A few food service directors stated that it was a challenge to get food service staff on board with the changes, because they did not want their job responsibilities or morning routine to change. Many food service directors reported the importance of involving food service staff in staffing and program decisions, which helped empower staff to take on different and extra duties. A few food service directors hired new staff members, but many other participants were able to rearrange duties and hours of existing staff. Participants that hired new staff members or increased staff hours reported the increase in revenue from the expanded SBP paid for the increase in staff time. Most food service directors built accountability and confidence into the different tasks their staff had to perform with the SBP expansion.

“It was really involving the staff saying we 're not going to add time, but how are we going to adjust your time to meet the needs of this program? “ - (Food Service Director)

All of the food service directors had to overcome many barriers and challenges that occurred while changing the SBP. Food service directors reported that weak internet connection, poor cart locations, maintaining student interest in the menu as well as maintaining staff enthusiasm for the program over time were all challenges they faced throughout the implementation and integration of the expanded SBP. Food service directors combat challenges by strategies that included hard-wiring point-of-sale equipment, changing cart locations several times until they found a spot students responded positively to, and changing menu items often to maintain student interest.

Most principals and food service directors indicated that teachers were supportive of the expanded SBP, and that most teachers and administration were flexible with students eating in designated classrooms and hallways of their schools. For example, one principal reported that teachers were flexible with students leaving early or coming into class a little late to grab a second chance breakfast.

Most food service directors and principals discussed student-led marketing campaigns at their respective schools. It was reported that students, teachers, administration, food service staff and even bus drivers and maintenance staff were involved in the marketing campaigns at a few of the schools. Principals and food service directors viewed the student-led marketing campaigns as crucial to creating student acceptance of the SBP and increasing participation.

Reflexive Monitoring: Increased SBP Participation Creates Sustainability

Principals and food service directors described how they assessed, monitored and evaluated their expanded SBPs to ensure they were integrated into the school environment. Most food service directors and principals reported that they systemized their expanded SBPs through student participation counts, and also reviewed revenue and expenditures of the program. Food service directors and administration discussed being able to sustain staffing and flexibility of policy changes as factors to consider in the sustainability of their expanded SBP. Study participants discussed their assessment of the SBP expansion project as beneficial for students. The expanded SBP was integrated into the school day and food service directors continually monitored their program to sustain the integration.

“I just think that this is a program that will continue, because it has become part of the school day now. And I think, from my perspective, that the high school has got it, that they’ve figured out that this is good for kids, this is good for what they’re doing here, getting their education, it’s just good overall, make sense, makes common sense to do this.” – (Food Service Director)

DISCUSSION

Previous research has reviewed SBP interventions^{1,2,3,12,15,20,21}, but has not yet explored the processes of how practices become sustained and embedded into the SBP routine of high school staff and students. Utilizing NPT, we organized the perceptions of food service directors and administration in expanding the SBP to understand methods of planning, implementing and integrating an expanded SBP into the daily routine of high school staff and students in rural Minnesota. Results can assist principals and food service directors in other schools in designing, implementing, and monitoring their own SBP expansion.

The NPT construct of *coherence* highlights the importance of exploring how participants are engaged in the sense making around new practices they are engaged in. Results suggest that centering students as key stakeholders and supporting that with process and data to help develop shared meaning may be particularly valuable in defining the expanded SBP and meeting program objectives. This finding has not been previously reported in the literature, and demonstrates the potential value of this component in understanding when modifications are adapted and when they may fail. Not all schools may have this type of alignment in values, which may be detrimental in developing and sustaining a new program into the school day. Lack of coherence was a barrier to implementing a successful expanded SBP in one of the schools that could not get administration and other staff on board with changes. This illustrates the importance of value alignment and considering student needs in attempts to modify the school day.

NPT describes the value of *cognitive participation* to undertake the relational work needed to develop new practices.¹⁶ Prior research regarding expanding the SBP has discussed the importance of engaging key staff members of the school in making decisions about the program^{1,2,3,12,22}, however, little has been reported in including and defining roles for parents, community members and students in the SBP expansion. Implementing and integrating the expanded SBP into the school was perceived as a collective activity among students and staff that could have supported student involvement and participation in the SBP. Including these other stakeholders, may facilitate the development of a SBP that reinforced their values and collectively met student needs and supported participation. Schools were perceived to have centered SBP expansion communication and program modifications on meeting the needs of the students, which could have been an important factor in engaging students in the implementation. Throughout these activities, it was perceived that students may have gained knowledge and enthusiasm for the SBP. Many prior studies discuss student attitudes and behavior around breakfast consumption and the SBP^{1, 18, 23}. This study may reinforce changing student behavior and acceptance of the program by centering the intervention on students and reaffirms previous findings of empowering students and working with them in creating change^{15, 21}. This study contributes to the understanding of the importance and value of including students, the primary stakeholder, as well as parties inside and outside of the school that influence students in supporting the normalization and integration of a perceived successful modified school program.

Research regarding expanding the SBP has primarily been based on what NPT would describe as the *collective action* tasks¹⁶ of creating and implementing the program^{1,2 3,12}. Throughout Project breakFAST, NPT established how principals and food service directors perceived to use the coherency of their student-centered values to create cognitive participation among school staff, which may have facilitated the collective action that occurred between staff and students to define, develop, and embed the expanded SBP into the school. Having both leaders, the food service directors and principals onboard, may have helped to create momentum for the program and support the operational work of the expanded program between school staff and students. Food service directors and principals perceived that rapport was built between and positively supported the staff and students in the SBP changes. This was perceived to help with staff acceptance and integration of the program into the school, which has been discussed as a barrier in previous literature published^{1,2}. The majority of food service directors played a key role in obtaining participation from the food service staff and defined their skill set workability within the collective action construct. Many principals may have supported the contextual integration of the expanded SBP by empowering teachers to create their own policies or procedures in their classrooms. Marketing the new Grab and Go breakfast was perceived to be important to increase the coherence of the SBP changes as well as may have contributed to obtaining cognitive participation among students, which illustrates the interactive nature of the NPT concepts. The inclusion of students and staff in defining and developing the program may assisted in creating a program that met the needs of not only the students, but the staff as well, which could have assisted in embedding the expanded program into the school environment.

Prior research with expanding the SBP discusses increased student participation with the program expansion^{1,2,3,12} but lacks information on the long-term sustainability of the program in schools. Utilizing NPT to explore the concept of *reflexive monitoring*, this research may support and establish a perceived embedded SBP into the schools and measures sustainability through participation counts. It appeared that schools in Project breakFAST understood the importance of monitoring their SBP participation counts from the beginning of the intervention and have continually assessed their program. Through this ongoing assessment, schools may ensure their program is continually meeting the needs of students and make adjustments when needed. Overlooking monitoring the program participation counts may result in failing to maintain participation in and sustainability of the SBP. Systemizing the SBP expansion through student participation counts is a useful practice for other schools to adopt when trying to expand their program.

Limitations

Although this research provides a an organized method to evaluate how the high schools in the Project breakFAST study planned and implemented their expanded SBP, it only considers the perceptions of the principal and food service director in each of the high schools. It would have been advantageous to hear about the changes from other school staff such as teachers, custodial, and other food service staff. Conducting interviews or focus groups with the students in the schools may have also assisted in understanding their involvement in the project as well as their perceptions of the changes to the SBP. The high schools involved in this study were all rural high schools in Minnesota and we cannot conclude how schools in urban or suburban areas would adopt this framework.

Conclusion/Implication for Research and Practice

This study suggests that increasing and sustaining participation in the SBP may be possible by understanding the evaluation of the implementation, embedding and integration of the expanded SBP in the Project breakFAST study schools. Utilizing NPT to evaluate the expanded SBP into the school environment can be particularly helpful in providing ways to implement expanded SBPs in rural schools that have limited resources. Taking a student-centered approach to the intervention and working with staff and students to define and develop a modified school program can assist with implementing and integrating the program into the school environment. Taking this approach may also support program acceptance and normalization among students and staff. Other schools may use the conceptual framework to develop and implement their own integrated school program.

Acknowledgments

The funding for this study is provided by the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health (R01HL113235 PI: Nanney, MS) ([ClinicalTrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT02004977) unique ID: NCT02004977).

REFERNECES

1. Nanney MS, Olaleye TM, Wang Q, Motyka E, Klund-Schubert J. A pilot study to expand the school breakfast program in one middle school. *Transl Behav Med.* 2011;1(3):436–442. [PubMed: 22308175]

2. Morris CT, Courtney A, Bryant CA, McDermott RJ. Grab n' go breakfast at school: observations from a pilot program. *J Nutr Educ Behav.* 2010;42(3):208–209. [PubMed: 20434076]
3. Olsta J Bringing Breakfast to Our Students. *J Sch Nurs.* 2013;29(4):2 doi: 10.1177/1059840513476094.
4. Food Research and Action Center. Many More Low-Income Children Starting the Day with School Breakfast, Find New Reports from the Food Research and Action Center. <http://frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/school-breakfast-program/>. Accessed August 27, 2015.
5. Nanney MS, Caspi C, Harnack L, Hearst M, Kubik M, Leduc R, and Wei S (2016). Project breakFAST: the final report. Available form <https://www.healthdisparities.umn.edu>. Accessed on 23rd April 2016.
6. Gross SM, Bronner Y, Welch C, Dewberry-Moore N, Paige DM. Breakfast and lunch meal skipping patterns among fourth-grade children from selected public schools in urban, suburban, and rural Maryland. *J Acad Nutr Diet.* 2004;104(3):420–423.
7. Carson J Many Eligible Children Don't Participate in School Nutrition Programs Reauthorization Offers Opportunities to Improve. Carsey Research. 2015; 85, 1–2.
8. Fox M, & Condon E School Nutrition Dietary Assessment Study IV, 2012 <http://www.fns.usda.gov/school-nutrition-dietary-assessment-study-iv>
9. Coleman-Jensen Alisha, Gregory Christian, and Singh Anita. Household Food Security in the United States in 2013, ERR-173, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 9 2014.
10. Swanson JA, Olson CM, Miller EO, Lawrence FC. Rural Mothers' Use of Formal Programs and Informal Social Supports to Meet Family Food Needs: A Mixed Methods Study. *J Fam Econ Iss.* 2008;29(4):674–690. doi:10.1007/s10834-008-9127-6.
11. Belansky ES, Cutforth N, Delong E, et al. Early Effects of the Federally Mandated Local Wellness Policy on School Nutrition Environments Appear Modest in Colorado's Rural, Low-Income Elementary Schools. *J Acad Nutr Diet.* 2010;110(11): 1712–1717. doi: 10.1016/j.jada.2010.08.004.
12. Haesly B, Nanney MS, Coulter S, Fong S, Pratt RJ. Impact on Staff of Improving Access to the School Breakfast Program: A Qualitative Study. *J Sch Health.* 2014;84(4):267–274. doi: 10.1111/josh.12142. [PubMed: 24617910]
13. Lucarelli JF, Alaimo K, Mang E, et al. Facilitators to Promoting Health in Schools: Is School Health Climate the Key? *J Sch Health.* 2014; 84(2): 133–140. doi: 10.1111/josh.12123. [PubMed: 25099428]
14. Maclellan D, Taylor J, Freeze C. Developing School Nutrition Policies: Enabling and Barrier Factors. *Can J Diet Pract Res.* 2009;70(4): 166–171. doi: 10.3148/70.4.2009.166. [PubMed: 19958571]
15. Askelson NM, Golembiewski EH, Depriest AM, O'Neill P, Delger PJ, Scheidel CA. The Always a Poster. *Soc Mar Q.* 2015;21(3):119–134. doi: 10.1177/1524500415589591.
16. May C, Murray E, Finch T, Mair F, Treweek S, Ballini L, Macfarlane A and Rapley T Normalization Process Theory On-line Users' Manual and Toolkit. 2010 <http://www.normalizationprocess.org>. Accessed on 26th August 2015.
17. May C, Finch T. Implementing, Embedding, and Integrating Practices: An Outline of Normalization Process Theory. *Sociology.* 2009;43(3):535–554. doi:10.1177/0038038509103208.
18. Charmaz K Grounded Theory. *Rethinking Methods in Psychology.* :27-49. doi: 10.4135/9781446221792.n3.
19. Burnard P Constructing Grounded Theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis Kathy Charmaz Constructing Grounded Theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis Sage 224 £19.99 0761973532 0761973532. *Nurs Res.* 2006; 13(4):84–84. doi: 10.7748/nr.13.4.84.s4.
20. Reddan J, Wahlstrom K, Reicks M. Childrens Perceived Benefits and Barriers in Relation to Eating Breakfast in Schools With or Without Universal School Breakfast. *J Nutr Educ Behav.* 2002;34(1): 47–52. doi:10.1016/s1499-4046(06)60226 [PubMed: 11917671]
21. Bailey-Davis L, Virus A, Mccoy TA, Wojtanowski A, Veur SSV, Foster GD. Middle School Student and Parent Perceptions of Government-Sponsored Free School Breakfast and

- Consumption: A Qualitative Inquiry in an Urban Setting. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2013;113(2):251–257. doi: 10.1016/j.jand.2012.09.017. [PubMed: 23351628]
22. Conklin MT, Bordi PL. Middle School Teachers' Perceptions of a "Grab 'n Go" Breakfast Program. *Top Clin Nutr*. 2003;18(3):192–198. doi: 10.1097/00008486-200307000-00008.
23. Harvey-Golding L, Donkin LM, Blackledge J, Defeyter MA. Universal Free School Breakfast: A Qualitative Model for Breakfast Behaviors. *Front Public Health*. 2015;3. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2015.00154.

Table 1.**Research and Interview Question Alignment with the NPT Core Constructs**

Research Question	Interview Question	Model Construct
What helps or hinders the implementation process?	What was the process of executing the new SBP at your school?	Collective Action
	What impact did the research team and extension have on changing the SBP at your school?	Coherence/Collective Action
	Did you use the student data from the research study? (If yes, how did you use it?) Did you share it with anyone?	Coherence
	What was the greatest asset in executing the changes to the SBP?	Collective Action
	Were students receptive to the changes of the SBP right away? Why or why not? • Did you have to change anything after executing the new SBP to make students more receptive to the program? ○ If so, what was the change? ○ How did it work?	Coherence/Collective Action
	Were students involved in executing the new SBP? • How were the students involved?	Cognitive Participation/Collective Action
	What was the greatest challenge in executing the changes to the SBP?	Collective Action
	What advice or best practices do you have for other schools who are interested in implementing the SBP?	Reflexive Monitoring
	Is there anything else about the SBP that you would like to share?	Reflexive Monitoring
What was the impact of changing the SBP?	How do you measure sustainability for your SBP?	Coherence/Reflexive Monitoring
	Foodservice: Is the SBP financially sustainable, if not, why?	Coherence
	Foodservice: How has the new SBP integration impacted foodservice staff? • How did your breakfast program change? • How did your menu change?	Cognitive Participation/Collective Action
	Principal/Administration: Is the SBP logistically sustainable, if not, why?	Coherence/Reflexive Monitoring
	Principal/Administration: How has the new SBP integration changed school policies (if any)?	Coherence/ Cognitive Participation/Collective Action
	Principal/Administration: How has the new SBP integration impacted teachers and classrooms? • How flexible have teachers and other staff been in implementing the SBP (probes: eating in classroom)	Coherence/ Cognitive Participation/Collective Action

Research Question	Interview Question	Model Construct
	Have the changes to the SBP impacted the climate/school community at your school? • How? • Principles/Administration: Have you seen behavioral changes?	Coherence/ Cognitive Participation/Collective Action
	How has the new SBP integration impacted students?	Coherence/Reflexive Monitoring
What was the difference between the early and delayed intervention schools?	Your role was _____. How do you think that role impacted your new SBP?	Coherence/Collective Action
	How has the SBP changed since you have been in the study? • Does your program look different from one year ago?	Reflexive Monitoring
	What was the most helpful in making changes to the SBP?	Collective Action
	What would you say was the greatest challenge or barrier to increasing SBP participation among students?	Collective Action
	Who if any were the champions in changing the SBP?	Cognitive Participation
	Who were the champions in gaining student participation?	Cognitive Participation

Table 2:

Summary of Findings by NPT Core Constructs

NPT Conceptual Area	Themes	Example Quotes
Coherence: How do people make sense of the practices they are implementing?	High level of agreement with concept of change	<i>"With our increasing population of students that are living in poverty, more and more of our students now qualify for free and reduced lunch, I think any time we have an opportunity for students to be fed and it's only going to increase their ability to become more engaged in classrooms, and obviously, the ultimate goal is to improve student achievement at that point."</i> —Principal
	Processes for engaging all stakeholders in the defining and planning	<i>"Well, we had a planning committee that met late winter, with the program to start the following fall. We had students on there, myself (principal), school nurse, social worker, representative from food service, our U of MN liaison. We just had planning meetings, we took a look at what other schools that had implemented the year before, what are some of the things they had done, what had worked well, and so we decided to offer Second Chance breakfast, we thought would go over well with our students."</i> - Principal
Cognitive Participation What relational work is needed to develop new practices together?	Communication	<i>"And so it really came down to making sure you communicated to all the individuals that needed to be part of that planning process so that we could implement and have implementation go smoothly."</i> - Food Service Director
	Multi-stakeholder communication strategies	<i>"We used some of the materials and had them translated into Spanish and Somali and sent a letter home about the middle of September to say, Hey, we've got this new program at the high school, if you qualify for free and reduced meals the meals are provided, here's the times that we're offering it. Please encourage your students to participate. I think that helped our participation as well because, like I said, having almost half the students free and reduced it just helped with our participation."</i> - Food Service Director
	Teacher involvement	<i>"At the beginning of the year we had our teachers explain what the grab and go breakfast was to all of our 1400 students here. So they were made aware of it."</i> - Principal
	Student-centered inclusion	<i>"One of the best things was working with the kids, because I really think that peer-to-peer marketing was very helpful."</i> - Food Service Director
Collective Action How are changes operationalized in the intervention?	Role identification	<i>"Involve the right people, whether it is school staff, food service staff, whether it is students, just have a broad base of members on the committee because of course if there is input across the board you have a stronger program to implement."</i> - Food Service Director
	Marketing and implementing the expanded SBP	<i>"Well, we certainly, the first week this was introduced the second week of school as far as the second chance breakfast and so that's when it took off and that first, after the showing of the film that morning, and the students again were the ones that did the basically the introduction to this to the rest of our student body and our food service staff was up on stage and everything and we had T-shirts printed specifically."</i> - Food Service Director
Reflexive Monitoring How do participants assess and adapt the new practices being implemented?	Integrating and embedding new daily job responsibilities	<i>As far as staffing, we basically worked it into their existing day and it really increased productivity as a result. I'm always looking at meals per labor hour at least when we're looking at budgets—monitoring budgets, I get the financial revenue and expenditures from their business manager several times throughout the year, so I'm looking at that and are we on track with where we should be with expenses and offsetting that with revenue. —Food Service Director</i>
	Assessing and monitoring the	<i>"You know, we would always review, again, locations and the food. We're always looking for new ideas; our vendors</i>

NPT Conceptual Area	Themes	Example Quotes
	program to maintain student interest	<i>assist us with that. They know that these programs are very important to us and to the students that we serve, and so they're usually trying to help us find new opportunities.</i> – Principal
	Increasing student participation	<i>"I'll tell you, when I've been there, its upbeat and positive. If it's always that way, then it has not hurt it. You know again, it's fulfilling a need that these students are telling us they want, be coming in and having breakfast."</i> – Food Service Director
	Developing a sustaining program	<i>"I guess just figuring out what was working, you know. Everybody was game to try something new so that was really exciting. People were excited about it and so there wasn't resistance to trying something new but I think just trying to figure out what was the best delivery method and what was working, and why weren't things working when we didn't see the bigger increases that we were hoping for so I think that was the biggest challenge, trying to figure it out."</i> – Food Service Director